

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present patent application based on the foregoing amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 12 are amended, claim 11 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter therein and claims 17 and 18 are newly added. Support for new claims 17 and 18 may be found throughout the original description. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, after entry of this Amendment, claims 1-10 and 12-18 will be pending in the patent application.

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Henderson *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,404,869) (hereinafter "Henderson") in view of the E-Plus pamphlet dated 1998 (hereinafter "E-Plus").

Claim 11 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, thus rendering moot the rejection of this claim.

With respect to claims 1-10 and 12-16, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because Henderson and E-Plus, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest all the features recited in the rejected claims.

For example, Henderson and E-Plus, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest a method comprising "maintaining subscriber information on at least one prepaid subscriber, defining at least two different prepaid profiles, each prepaid profile defining at least one attribute for the prepaid service, the attribute indicating how the prepaid service is to be provided; associating the prepaid subscriber's subscriber information with one of the at least two different prepaid profiles, and providing the prepaid service to the prepaid subscriber as indicated by the attribute defined in the one prepaid profile associated with the prepaid subscriber's information", as recited in claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Furthermore, Henderson and E-Plus, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest a telecommunications system offering prepaid subscription services, the system comprising "at least one database having subscriber information on at least one prepaid subscriber, wherein the system is arranged to maintain at least two different prepaid profiles, each prepaid profile defining at least one attribute for the prepaid service, the attribute indicating how the prepaid service is to be provided; to associate the prepaid subscriber's subscriber information with one of the at least two different prepaid profiles; and

to provide a prepaid service to the prepaid subscriber as indicated by the attribute defined in the associated prepaid profile,” as recited in claim 7 and its dependent claims.

Moreover, Henderson and E-Plus, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest a network element in a telecommunications system including “a database containing at least two different prepaid profile definitions, each prepaid profile defining at least one attribute for the prepaid service, the attribute indicating how a prepaid service is to be provided,” as recited in claim 12 and its dependent claims.

The Office Action conceded on page 3, lines 11-17, that Henderson fails to disclose, teach or suggest how the prepaid service is to be updated during recharge. However, Applicants respectfully submit that there are additional features that are absent in Henderson.

For example, and as acknowledged by the Office Action of January 11, 2006, Henderson does not disclose, teach or suggest associating subscription information with a prepaid account. (*See, e.g.*, page 3, lines 17-19 of the January 11th Office Action). As another example, Henderson does not disclose, teach or suggest defining at least two different profiles.

The Examiner referred to col. 5, lines 16-53 of Henderson as allegedly disclosing, teaching or suggesting defining at least two prepaid profiles, each prepaid profile defining at least one attribute for the prepaid service. Respectfully, those cited portions are silent as to these features. In particular, it is respectfully submitted that the card usage data and the location identifiers of Henderson do not correspond, in any way, to different profiles, as recited in claims 1-10 and 12-16.

Further, even assuming card usage data and location identifiers correspond to two different profiles, as erroneously alleged by the Office Action, Henderson would still not disclose the features of associating the prepaid subscriber’s subscriber information with one of the at least two different prepaid profiles. Based on the Office Action’s reasoning, each subscriber’s subscriber information in Henderson must always be associated with two different profiles because Henderson teaches that card usage data are associated with one location identifier to calculate the call charge. (*See, e.g.*, col. 5, lines 54-56 and col. 6, lines 44-47 of Henderson). However, such interpretation is contrary to the invention of claims 1-16, in which the subscriber’s subscriber information are associated with one of the at least two prepaid profiles.

E-Plus fails to remedy the deficiencies of Henderson. Specifically, E-Plus fails to disclose, teach or suggest, for example, defining at least two different prepaid profiles, each prepaid profile defining at least one attribute for the prepaid service, the attribute indicating

how the prepaid service is to be provided; associating the prepaid subscriber's subscriber information with one of the at least two different prepaid profiles, and providing the prepaid service to the prepaid subscriber as indicated by the attribute defined in the one prepaid profile associated with the prepaid subscriber's information.

The Office Action referred to E-Plus as allegedly disclosing, teaching or suggesting at least two prepaid services and alleged that the combination of Henderson and E-Plus would "provide for a more flexible prepaid service that allows users more options to choose when recharging prepaid service." Applicants respectfully disagree with this determination.

The alleged motivation, to "provide for a more flexible prepaid service that allows users more options to choose when recharging prepaid service", does not appear to have any relevance either to the claims or to the combination of Henderson and E-Plus and no evidence in any of the references is provided to support this conclusion. It is also not clear as to how the teaching that the account may be recharged with different amounts discloses, teaches or suggests that a subscriber's information is updated during the recharge. Furthermore, the claimed attribute is not selectable by the user at the time of the recharge.

E-Plus merely discloses a prepaid service having attributes, such as validity time and a credit time window. However, unlike claims 1-16, E-Plus is silent as to prepaid profiles. The validity time disclosed in E-Plus depends on the amount of the recharge. The credit time window disclosed in E-Plus depends on the prepaid service provider (E-Plus discloses that "the conditions stated in the tariff brochure of your service provider apply"). None of these attributes correspond to a prepaid profile. E-Plus also discloses that a period during which a user can be contacted after the expiry of the credit time depends on a selected tariff schedule. However, a tariff schedule is not a prepaid profile. Further, the tariff schedule may be used with postpaid subscribers as well.

Thus, E-Plus fails to disclose, teach or suggest, for example, defining at least two different prepaid profiles, each prepaid profile defining at least one attribute for the prepaid service, the attribute indicating how the prepaid service is to be provided. As another example, E-Plus fails to disclose, teach or suggest an attribute indicating how a subscriber's information is to be updated during recharge.

Accordingly, any proper combination of Henderson and E-Plus cannot result in the invention of claims 1-10 and 12-16.

Claims 17 and 18 are newly added to define additional subject matter that is novel and non-obvious over the art of record. Claims 17 and 18 are patentable over the art of record for

ANDRESEN ET AL. — 10/069,485
Client/Matter: 060258-0290643

at least similar reasons as provided above for claims 1-10 and 12-16 and for the features recited therein. Therefore, its is respectfully submitted that claims 17 and 18 are in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, all rejections having been addressed, Applicants request issuance of a notice of allowance indicating the allowability of all pending claims. If anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, Applicants request that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

#54248

 *Christophe LAIR*
CHRISTINE H. MCCARTHY

Reg. No. 41844

Tel. No. 703.770.7743

Fax No. 703.770.7901

CHM/CFL/smm
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 770-7900